Case 1:04-cv-10158-MLW Document 6 Filed 04/21/2004 Page 1 of 17

The Commonwealth of Massachusetts

Registry of Motor Vehicles FINE OFFICE

One Copley Place, Boston 02116 20 21 P 2:34

Kimberly Hinden Registrar

Boston MA 02119-9100 www.ma.gov/rmv

April 13, 2004

John C. Ottenberg, Esq. Ottenberg & Dunkless LLP 101 Arch Street Boston, MA 02110

RE: ROBERT OLAFSON and PATRICIA OLAFSON VS. KYLE E. BYRNE, an entity identified in part as BFI, and MARGARET HAMILL. UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS, CIVIL ACTION NO# 04 10158MLW.

Dear Atty. Ottenberg:

The attached process has been served on the defendant pursuant to the provisions of M.G.L. c. 90 §3D. Below please find the executed affidavit set forth in §3D, which by law serves as prima facie evidence of service upon that party.

# AFFIDAVIT

This hereby certifies that the attached process served upon the Registrar of Motor Vehicles was forwarded by mail April 13, 2004, postage prepaid, to Kyle E. Byrne at the last address appearing in the Registrar's records. This is in accordance with the provisions of M.G.L. c. 90, §3D.

Signed under the pains and penalties of perjury on April 13, 2004.

Signed:

Kathleen Munson, Keeper of the Records

# UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

District of

Massachusetts

ROBERT OLAFSON, ET. AL.

V.

KYLE E. BYRNE, ET. AL.

04 TO THE ACTION W

CASE NUMBER:

TO: (Name and address of Defendant)

Kyle E. Byrne 90 Massasoit Avenue "Oak Bluffs" MA

YOU ARE HEREBY SUMMONED and required to serve on PLAINTIFF'S ATTORNEY (name and address)

John C. Ottenberg 101 Arch Street Boston, MA 02110

APR 0 8 2004

can answer to the complaint which is served on you with this summons, within twenty days after service of this summons of you, exclusive of the day of service. If you fail to do so, judgment by default will be taken against you for the relief demanded in the complaint. Any answer that you serve on the parties to this action must be filed with the Clerk of this Court within a reasonable period of time after service.



THE 23 2004

DATE

Depart Shorting Smell Councy

# UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS

ROBERT OLAFSON and PATRICIA OLAFSON	) ) ):
<b>v.</b>	) )
KYLE E. BYRNE, an Entity identified in part as BFI, and MARGARET HAMILL	) ) )

CIVIL ACTION NO. 04-10158 MLW

## **COMPLAINT**

#### AND JURY DEMAND

#### INTRODUCTORY STATEMENT

This case arises out of an event on October 14, 2002, in which a motor vehicle driven by the defendant, Kyle E. Byrne, an employee of the defendant which is identified herein as BFI, negligently struck a motor vehicle occupied by the plaintiffs, Robert Olafson and Patricia Olafson. A third vehicle driven by the defendant, Margaret Hamill, was also a substantial cause of the accident. The plaintiffs suffered serious bodily injuries and seek damages as a result of the defendants' actions.

## **PARTIES**

- 1. The plaintiffs, Robert Olafson and Patricia Olafson ("Olafsons"), are husband and wife and reside at 13448 Redberry Circle, Plainfield, Illinois.
- 2. The defendant Kyle E. Byrne ("Byrne") resides at 90 Massasoit Avenue, Oak Bluffs, Massachusetts. He was the driver of the motor vehicle that struck the vehicle occupied by the Olafsons on October 14, 2002.

- 3. Another defendant has not yet been fully identified, but is a corporation which is believed to have "BFI" in its name ("BFI"). The exact name will be identified through discovery in this case. BFI has a place of business in Dukes County, Massachusetts. On information and belief, BFI has neither its principal place of business nor is it incorporated in Illinois. As of October 14, 2002, Byrne was an employee of BFI, and at the time of the accident, Byrne was driving the motor vehicle, a garbage truck, in furtherance of that employment.
- 4. The defendant Margaret Hamill ("Hamill") resides at 368 Branch Road, Roxbury, New Hampshire.

### JURISDICTION AND VENUE

5. The jurisdiction of this Court is based upon the diversity of citizenship of the parties, and the amount in controversy exceeds \$75,000, exclusive of interest and costs. This Court has original jurisdiction of this action under the provisions of 28 U.S.C. §1332. The plaintiffs are citizens of Illinois and the defendants are all citizens of states other than Illinois. Venue is proper pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §1391(a), for the reasons that the motor vehicle accident, from which this case arises, occurred in Massachusetts and at least one of the defendants resides in Massachusetts.

#### FACTUAL BACKGROUND

- 6. On October 14, 2002, the plaintiffs were the occupants of a motor vehicle driven by Robert Olafson proceeding in a westerly direction on West Tisbury Road on Martha's Vineyard, Massachusetts.
- 7. At that time and place, a garbage truck operated by the defendant Byrne, and in the service of the defendant BFI, was proceeding behind the Olafson vehicle. The motor vehicle

driven by Byrne was tailgating the Olafson vehicle.

- 8. At that same time, a motor vehicle driven by the defendant Hamill was proceeding on Barnes Road, toward the intersection with West Tisbury Road. The vehicle driven by Hamill proceeded to go through a Stop sign located at the intersection of Barnes Road and West Tisbury Road and commenced to proceed into the intersection.
- 9. Robert Olafson observed the vehicle driven by Hamill proceed through the Stop sign and reacted appropriately to that vehicle, slowing his vehicle and positioning his vehicle so as to avoid any contact with Hamill's vehicle.
- 10. Because Byrne was tailgating the Olafsons, he was unable to avoid the Olafson vehicle and struck the Olafson vehicle in the rear. The Olafson vehicle was struck with great force.
- 11. A police officer of the Edgartown Police Department investigated the accident and issued the defendant Byrne a written Warning at the scene for following the Olafson vehicle too closely.
- 12. As a result of the impact, the plaintiff, Robert Olafson, suffered serious physical injuries that required him to obtain substantial medical care and treatment. In addition, he experienced substantial pain and suffering. Further, he suffered an impairment of his earning capacity.
- 13. As a result of the impact, the plaintiff, Patricia Olafson, suffered serious physical injuries that required her to obtain substantial medical care and treatment. In addition, she experienced substantial pain and suffering. Further, she suffered an impairment of her earning capacity.

14. Byrne, BFI and Hamill are joint tortfeasors, and all are liable, in full, for the injuries and losses suffered by the plaintiffs.

#### COUNT I

#### ROBERT OLAFSON v. KYLE E. BYRNE

# <u>Negligence</u>

- 15. The preceding allegations of this Complaint are incorporated herein.
- 16. The defendant Byrne so negligently operated his motor vehicle so as to cause it to strike the motor vehicle occupied by Robert Olafson.
- 17. As a result of the negligence of the defendant Byrne, the plaintiff, Robert Olafson, sustained injuries of body and mind, incurred expenses for medical care and attendance, suffered a loss of earning capacity and otherwise suffered damages.

WHEREFORE, the plaintiff, Robert Olafson, demands judgment against the defendant, Kyle E. Byrne, in an amount to be ascertained and established, together with interest and costs of this action.

#### COUNT II

#### ROBERT OLAFSON v. BFI

# Agency / Respondent Superior

- 18. The preceding allegations of this Complaint are incorporated herein.
- 19. At the time the motor vehicle operated by the defendant Byrne struck the motor vehicle occupied by the plaintiff, Robert Olafson, Byrne was acting as the employee, agent and/or servant of the defendant BFI.
  - 20. As a result of the negligence of the defendant Byrne, who was operating a motor

vehicle in the service of BFI and as its employee, agent and/or servant, the plaintiff, Robert Olafson, sustained injuries of body and mind, incurred expenses for medical care and attendance, suffered a loss of earning capacity, and otherwise suffered damages.

WHEREFORE, the plaintiff, Robert Olafson, demands judgment be entered against the defendant BFI in an amount to be ascertained and established, together with interest and costs of this action.

#### COUNT III

#### PATRICIA OLAFSON v. KYLE E. BYRNE

#### Negligence

- 21. The preceding allegations of this Complaint are incorporated herein.
- 22. The defendant Byrne so negligently operated his motor vehicle so as to cause it to strike the motor vehicle occupied by Patricia Olafson.
- 23. As a result of the negligence of the defendant Byrne, the plaintiff, Patricia Olafson, sustained injuries of body and mind, incurred expenses for medical care and attendance, suffered a loss of earning capacity and otherwise suffered damages.

WHEREFORE, the plaintiff, Patricia Olafson, demands judgment against the defendant, Kyle E. Byrne, in an amount to be ascertained and established, together with interest and costs of this action.

#### **COUNT IV**

#### PATRICIA OLAFSON v. BFI

#### Agency / Respondent Superior

24. The preceding allegations of this Complaint are incorporated herein.

- 25. At the time the motor vehicle operated by the defendant Byrne struck the motor vehicle occupied by the plaintiff, Patricia Olafson, Byrne was acting as the employee, agent and/or servant of the defendant BFI.
- 26. As a result of the negligence of the defendant Byrne, who was operating a motor vehicle in the service of BFI and as its employee, agent and/or/servant, the plaintiff, Patricia Olafson, sustained injuries of body and mind, incurred expenses for medical care and attendance, suffered a loss of earning capacity, and otherwise suffered damages.

WHEREFORE, the plaintiff, Patricia Olafson, demands judgment be entered against the defendant BFI in an amount to be ascertained and established, together with interest and costs of this action.

#### COUNT V

#### ROBERT OLAFSON v. MARGARET HAMILL

# **Negligence**

- 27. The preceding allegations of this Complaint are incorporated herein.
- 28. The defendant Hamill so negligently operated her motor vehicle so as to be a substantial cause of the motor vehicle collision injuring Robert Olafson.
- 29. As a result of the negligence of the defendant Hamill, the plaintiff, Robert Olafson, sustained injuries of body and mind, incurred expenses for medical care and attendance, suffered a loss of earning capacity and otherwise suffered damages.

WHEREFORE, the plaintiff, Robert Olafson, demands judgment against the defendant,

Margaret Hamill, in an amount to be ascertained and established, together with interest and costs

of this action.

#### COUNT VI

#### PATRICIA OLAFSON v. MARGARET HAMILL

#### Negligence -

- 30. The preceding allegations of this Complaint are incorporated herein.
- 31. The defendant Hamill so negligently operated her motor vehicle so as to be a substantial cause of the motor vehicle collision injuring Patricia Olafson.
- 32. As a result of the negligence of the defendant Hamill, the plaintiff, Patricia Olafson, sustained injuries of body and mind, incurred expenses for medical care and attendance, suffered a loss of earning capacity and otherwise suffered damages.

WHEREFORE, the plaintiff, Patricia Olafson, demands judgment against the defendant, Margaret Hamill, in an amount to be ascertained and established, together with interest and costs of this action.

#### COUNT VII

#### ROBERT OLAFSON v. KYLE E. BYRNE

#### Consortium

- 33. The preceding allegations of this Complaint are incorporated herein.
- 34. Robert Olafson is the spouse of Patricia Olafson and the person entitled by law to the care, comfort, services and consortium of Patricia Olafson.
- 35. As a result of the negligence of the defendant Byrne, the plaintiff, Robert Olafson, sustained the loss of the care, comfort, services and consortium of his spouse, Patricia Olafson.

WHEREFORE, the plaintiff, Robert Olfason, demands judgment be entered against the defendant, Kyle E. Byrne, in an amount to be ascertained and established, together with interest

and costs of this action.

#### COUNT VIII

#### ROBERT OLAFSON v. BFI

# Consortium

- 36. The preceding allegations of this Complaint are incorporated herein.
- 37. Robert Olafson is the spouse of Patricia Olafson and the person entitled by law to the care, comfort, services and consortium of Patricia Olafson.
- 38. As a result of the negligence of the defendant BFI's agent, servant and/or employee, the plaintiff, Robert Olafson, sustained the loss of the care, comfort, services and consortium of his spouse, Patricia Olafson.

WHEREFORE, the plaintiff, Robert Olfason, demands judgment be entered against the defendant BFI in an amount to be ascertained and established, together with interest and costs of this action.

#### COUNT IX

## ROBERT OLAFSON v. MARGARET HAMILL

#### Consortium

- 39. The preceding allegations of this Complaint are incorporated herein.
- 40. Robert Olafson is the spouse of Patricia Olafson and the person entitled by law to the care, comfort, services and consortium of Patricia Olafson.
- 41. As a result of the negligence of the defendant Hamill, the plaintiff, Robert Olafson, sustained the loss of the care, comfort, services and consortium of his spouse, Patricia Olafson.

  WHEREFORE, the plaintiff, Robert Olfason, demands judgment be entered against the

defendant, Margaret Hamill, in an amount to be ascertained and established, together with interest and costs of this action.

#### COUNT X

# PATRICIA OLAFSON v. KYLE E. BYRNE

#### Consortium

- 42. The preceding allegations of this Complaint are incorporated herein.
- 43. Patricia Olafson is the spouse of Robert Olafson and the person entitled by law to the care, comfort, services and consortium of Robert Olafson.
- 44. As a result of the negligence of the defendant Byrne, the plaintiff, Patricia Olafson, sustained the loss of the care, comfort, services and consortium of her spouse, Robert Olafson.

WHEREFORE, the plaintiff, Patricia Olfason, demands judgment be entered against the defendant, Kyle E. Byrne, in an amount to be ascertained and established, together with interest and costs of this action.

#### COUNT XI

### PATRICIA OLAFSON v. BFI

#### Consortium

- 45. The preceding allegations of this Complaint are incorporated herein.
- 46. Patricia Olafson is the spouse of Robert Olafson and the person entitled by law to the care, comfort, services and consortium of Robert Olafson.
- 47. As a result of the negligence of the defendant BFI's agent, servant and/or employee, the plaintiff, Patricia Olafson, sustained the loss of the care, comfort, services and consortium of her spouse, Robert Olafson.

WHEREFORE, the plaintiff, Patricia Olafson, demands judgment be entered against the defendant BFI in an amount to be ascertained and established, together with interest and costs of this action.

#### COUNT XII

#### PATRICIA OLAFSON v. MARGARET HAMILL

#### Consortium

- 48. The preceding allegations of this Complaint are incorporated herein.
- 49. Patricia Olafson is the spouse of Robert Olafson and the person entitled by law to the care, comfort, services and consortium of Robert Olafson.
- 50. As a result of the negligence of the defendant Hamill, the plaintiff, Patricia Olafson, sustained the loss of the care, comfort, services and consortium of her spouse, Robert Olafson.

WHEREFORE, the plaintiff, Patricia Olafson, demands judgment be entered against the defendant, Margaret Hamill, in an amount to be ascertained and established, together with interest and costs of this action.

ROBERT OLAFSON and PATRICIA OLAFSON By their attorney,

John C. Ottenberg, Esq. (BBO #380955)

Ottenberg & Dunkless LLP

101 Arch Street

Boston, MA 02110

617-342-8600

Dated: January 21, 2004

THE PLAINTIFFS DEMAND A TRIAL BY JURY ON ALL ISSUES.

# UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS

	OF CASE	(NAME OF FIRST PARTY ON EACH SIDE ONLY)RObe			-
		Kyle E. Byrne, et al.			4.
CATE	ORY IN	WHICH THE CASE BELONGS BASED UPON THE NUMBERS	ED NATURE OF	SUIT CODE LIST	ED ON THE CIVI
COVE	R SHEET.	(SEE LOCAL RULE 40.1(A)(I)).			
	I.	160, 410, 470, R.23, REGARDLESS OF NATURE OF SUIT.		•	
_	и.	195, 368, 400, 440, 441-444, 540, 550, 625, 710, 720, 730, 740, 790, 791, 820, 830, 840, 850, 890, 892-894, 895, 950.			
<u>35</u> 0	m.	110, 120, 130, 140, 151, 190, 210, 230, 240, 245, 290, 310, 315, 320, 330, 340, 345, 350, 355, 360, 362, 365, 370, 371, 380, 385, 450, 891.	· ·		
	IV.	220, 422, 423, 430, 460, 510, 530, 610, 620, 630, 640, 650, 66 690, 810, 861-865, 870, 871, 875, 900.	0,		
	v.	150, 152, 153.	•		
TITLE	4.5	MBER, IF ANY, OF RELATED CASES. (SEE LOCAL RULE 4	10.1(E)).	: :	
HAS A		CTION BETWEEN THE SAME PARTIES AND BASED ON THI	E SAME CLAIM	EVER BEEN FILE	D IN THIS COUR
PUBLI	C INTERI	IPLAINT IN THIS CASE QUESTION THE CONSTITUTIONA  ST?NO  LS.A. OR AN OFFICER, AGENT OR EMPLOYEE OF THE U.			S AFFECTING TH
	S CASE R	EQUIRED TO BE HEARD AND DETERMINED BY A DISTRIC	T COURT OF 1	HREE JUDGES PU	RSUANT TO TITE
COUN	<u>TY</u> ) - (SEI	S IN THIS ACTION RESIDE IN THE CENTRAL SECTION OF LOCAL RULE 40.1(C)). YES NO MPDEN OR HAMPSHIRE COUNTIES? - (SEE LOCAL RULE	OR IN TH	E WESTERN SECT	
المعقدي		WE DEN OR HAME SHIRE COUNTES: - (SEE LOCAL ROLE		s No	
	I OF THE		•		
DO AL		E PARTIES RESIDING IN MASSACHUSETTS RESIDE IN THE	E CENTRAL A	ND/OR WESTERN	
DO <u>Al</u> DISTR	ICT? Y	E PARTIES RESIDING IN MASSACHUSETTS RESIDE IN TH	•	ND/OR WESTERN	
DO <u>Al</u> DISTR THE P	ICT? Y	E PARTIES RESIDING IN MASSACHUSETTS RESIDE IN THE	E CENTRAL AI	ND/OR WESTERN IF YES, IN WH	
DO AL DISTR THE P IN WH	ICT? Y LAINTIFF IICH SECT Y OF THE CY OF TH	E PARTIES RESIDING IN MASSACHUSETTS RESIDE IN THE  ES NO  RESIDE?	E CENTRAL AI  (a)  TTS RESIDE?_  OF MASSACH	ND/OR WESTERN IF YES, IN WH Eastern USETTS, OR ANY	ICH SECTION DO
DO AL DISTR THE P IN WH IF AND AGENO	ICT? Y LAINTIFF IICH SECT Y OF THE CY OF TH OR V	E PARTIES RESIDING IN MASSACHUSETTS RESIDE IN THE ESNO  RESIDE?	E CENTRAL AI  (a)  TTS RESIDE?_  OF MASSACH	ND/OR WESTERN IF YES, IN WH Eastern USETTS, OR ANY	ICH SECTION DOI
DO AL DISTR THE P IN WH IF AND AGENO LEASE TOTORNEY	LAINTIFF IICH SECT Y OF THE CY OF TH OR V  YPE OR P.	E PARTIES RESIDING IN MASSACHUSETTS RESIDE IN THE  ESNO  RESIDE?	E CENTRAL AI  (a)  TTS RESIDE?  OF MASSACH RTIES RESIDE	ND/OR WESTERN IF YES, IN WH Eastern USETTS, OR ANY IN THE CENTRAI	GOVERNMENTA
DO AL DISTR THE P IN WH IF AND AGENO	LAINTIFF IICH SECT Y OF THE CY OF TH OR V  YPE OR P.	E PARTIES RESIDING IN MASSACHUSETTS RESIDE IN THE ESNO  RESIDE?	E CENTRAL AI  (a)  TTS RESIDE?  OF MASSACH RTIES RESIDE	ND/OR WESTERN IF YES, IN WH Eastern USETTS, OR ANY IN THE CENTRAI	GOVERNMENTA

Case 1:04-cv-10158-MLW Document 6 Filed 04/21/2004 Page 14 of 17 The JS-44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service of pleadings or other papers as required by law, except as provided by local rules of court. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the purpose of initiating the civil docket sheet. (SEE INSTRUCTIONS ON THE REVERSE OF THE FORM.) I. (a) PLAINTIFFS DEFENDANTS Robert Olafson and Patricia Olafson Kyle E. Byrne, an entity identified in part as BFI, and Margaret Hamill (b) COUNTY OF RESIDENCE OF FIRST LISTED PLAINTIFF Dukes COUNTY OF RESIDENCE OF FIRST LISTED DEFENDANT (EXCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES) (IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES ONLY) IN LAND CONDEMNATION CASES, USE THE LOCATION OF THE TRACT OF LAND INVOLVED. (C) ATTORNEYS (FIRM NAME, ADDRESS, AND TELEPHONE NUMBER) ATTORNEYS (IF KNOWN) John C. Ottenberg, Esq. (617) 342-8600 Ottenberg & Dunkless LLP 101 Arch Street, Boston, MA 02110 **II. BASIS OF JURISDICTION** (PLACE AN "X" IN ONE BOX ONLY) III. CITIZENSHIP OF PRINCIPAL PARTIES (PLACE AN 'X' IN ONE BOX FOR PLAINTIFF (For Diversity Cases Only) AND ONE BOX FOR DEFENDANT) DEF PTF DEF □ + U.S. Government ☐ 3 Federal Question Citizen of This State ďι Incorporated or Principal Place 🔲 4 [] 1 Plaintiff **[]** 4. (U.S. Government Not a Party) of Business In This State ☐ 2.U.S. Government 15 4 Diversity Citizen of Another State 10 2  $\Box \hat{z}$ Incorporated and Principal Place D 5 Detendant (Indicate Citizenship of Parties of Business In Another State in item III) Citizen or Subject of a 🖂 з 📋 з Foreign Nation 06 06 Foreign Country IV. ORIGIN (PLACE AN "X" IN ONE BOX ONLY) Appeal to District Transferred from Judge from X Original 2 Removed from ☐ 3 Remanded from: # Reinstated or D 5 another district- Multidistriet Macistrate Proceeding State Court O 7 Appellate Court Reopened (specify) Litigation Juagment V. NATURE OF SUIT (PLACE AN "X" IN ONE BOX ONLY) CONTRACT TORTS FORFEITURE/PENALTY BANKRUPTCY OTHER STATUTES ☐ 110 Insurance PERSONAL INJURY PERSONAL INJURY ☐ 610 Agriculture ☐ 620 Other Food & Drug 422 Appeal 28 USC 158 400 State Reapportionment ☐ 316 Alrolane ☐ 362 Personal Injury – Med. Malpractice A10 Antitrust 130 Miller Act ☐ 625 Drug Related Selzure of Property 21 USC 881 ☐ 315 Airplane Product Liability 423 Withdrawal 28 USC 157 430 Sanks and Banking ☐ 365 Personal Injury --Product Liability 140 Negotiable instrument ☐ 150 Recovery of Overpayment & Enforcement of Judgment 450 Commerce/ICC Rates/etc. ☐ 320 Assault, Libel & ☐ 636 Union Laws ☐ 466 Deportation Slande 368 Asbestos Personal injury Product Liability ☐ 640 R.R. & Truck PROPERTY RIGHTS ☐ 336 Federal Employers Liability 470 Racketeer influenced and 151 Medicare Act 650 Airline Regs. Corrupt Organizations 152 Recovery of Defaulted Student Loans □ 820 Copyrights 580 Occupational. Safety/Health ☐ 818 Selective Service. ☐ 349 Martne PERSONAL PROPERTY 330 Patient Excl Veterans) 345 Marine Product Liability ☐ 840 Trademark ☐ #50 Securities/Commodities/ ☐ 370 Other Fraud. ☐ 690 Other Exchange ☐ 153 Recovery of Overpayment of Veteran's Benefits 371 Truth in Lending ☐ 875 Customer Challenge 12 USC 3410 23 350 Motor Vehicle 380 Other Personal Property Damage LABOR SOCIAL SECURITY 160 Stockholders' Suits 355 Motor Vehicle Product Liability ☐ 851 Agricultural Acts 190 Other Contract 385 Property Damage Product Liability 710 Fair Labor Standards 361 HA (13956) 195 Contract Product Uability \$92 Economic Stabilization Act ☐ 862 Black Lung (923) ☐ 360 Other Personal Injury ☐ 893 Environmental Matters 720 Labor/Mgmt. Relations ☐ 863 CIWC/DIWW (405(g)) **REAL PROPERTY** 1 994 Energy Allocation Act CIVIL RIGHTS PRISONER PETITIONS ☐ 464 SSID Title XVI □ #95 Freedom of ☐ 730 Labor/Algmt. Reporting & Disclosure Act 345 RSI (405(g)) ☐ 219 Land Condemnation 441 Voting 516 Motions to Vacate Sentence information Act 999 Appeal of Fee Determination Under Equal Access to Justice ☐ 220 Foreclosure F1 442 Employment 746 Railway Labor Act FEDERAL TAX SUITS 230 Peril Lease & Ejectment 443 Housing/ Accommodations Habeas Corpus: General 350 Constitutionality of 17 249 Torts to Land ☐ 790 Other Labor Litigation State Statutes 245 Tort Product Liability C 535 Death Penalty ☐ 444 Welfare 1 870 Taxes (U.S. Plaintiff 290 All Other Real Property 440 Other Civil Rights or Defendant) ☐ \$96 Other Statutory Actions [] 540 Mandamus & Other ☐ 791 Empl. Ret. Inc. 871 IRS - Third Party 26 USC 7609 550 Civil Rights (CITE THE U.S. CIVIL STATUTE UNDER WHICH YOU ARE FILING AND WRITE BRIEF STATEMENT OF CAUSE, DO NOT CITE JURISDICTIONAL STATUTES UNLESS DIVERSITY.) VI. CAUSE OF ACTION Motor vehicle accident case. Diversity action, see 28 U.S.C. Section 1332. DEMAND s in excess

VII. REQUESTED IN CHECK YES only if demanded in complaint: CHECK IF THIS IS A CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT: UNDER F.R.C.P. 23 of \$75,000 JURY DEMAND: E YES II NO VIII. RELATED CASE(S) (See instructions): JUDGE IF ANY DOCKET NUMBER DATE SIGNATURE OF ATTORNEY OF RECORD 1/21/04 FOR OFFICE USE ONLY RECEIPT #\_ AMOUNT. APPLYING IFP. JUDGE MAG. JUDGE

The appointment of the Registrar as an agent for service of process under this section is irrevocable, and does not terminate with the death of a principal, since the agency is created for the benefit of third persons.<sup>22</sup>

In general, operation of a rental vehicle or trailer in the Commonwealth does not generally permit service on the non-resident rental company or person owning the vehicle, in the absence of an agency relationship, and thus service on the owner cannot be accomplished under Section 3A.<sup>23</sup>

So, too, where a non-resident defendant purchased an automobile, registered it at his home and furnished it to his daughter, a resident of Massachusetts, solely for her social or personal purposes, if the daughter at the time of the accident in Massachusetts, was not operating the vehicle for purposes of the defendant, service upon the defendant is not available under M.G.L.A. c. 90, § 3A, and the provisions of M.G.L.A. c. 231, § 85A and B, regarding prima facie evidence of agency, which are procedural statutes only, do not serve to extend the scope of the provisions of M.G.L.A. c. 90 regarding service upon non-residents.<sup>24</sup>

#### Library References:

C.J.S. Motor Vehicles § 501, 502(1). West's Key No. Digests, Automobiles ≈235.

# § 26.4 Service on Licensed Resident Motorist or By Registration in the Commonwealth

M.G.L.A. c. 90, § 3D provides that a resident motorist who applies for or is issued a license or registration by the Commonwealth is deemed to have appointed Registrar of Motor Vehicles as his attorney for service of process in suits arising out of use of the highways.

The statute provides that "[s]ervice of such process shall be made by leaving duplicate copies thereof with a fee ... in the hands of the Registrar, or in his office, and the Registrar shall forthwith send one of said copies by mail, postage prepaid, addressed to the defendant at his last address as appearing on the Registrar's records; and an affidavit of the Registrar, or of any person authorized by him to send such copy, that such copy has been so mailed shall be prima facie evidence thereof. One of the duplicates of such process, certified by the Registrar as having been served upon him, shall be sufficient evidence of service upon him."

One must comply with the statutory provisions to ensure notice, however, in particular by obtaining an affidavit from the Registrar certifying that a copy of the process has been mailed to the appropriate

22. Toczko v. Armentano, 341 Mass. 474, 170 N.E.2d 703 (1960). **24.** Segal v. Yates, 356 Mass. 449, 253 N.E.2d 841 (1969).

23. Gately v. U-Haul Co., 350 Mass. 483, 215 N.E.2d 743 (1966).

# § 26.4

#### PRACTICE AND PROCEDURE

Ch. 26

party sought to be served. Dismissal is generally required for failure to serve where no affidavit of compliance is filed.<sup>1</sup>

Jurisdiction over a defendant has been upheld based on timely service on Registrar, even though Registrar did not mail a copy of process to defendant until one month later.<sup>2</sup> The statute makes accommodation for delays in notice by mandating that a defendant must be afforded a reasonable opportunity to defend.<sup>3</sup>

The purpose of making the Registrar an agent for service of process on a resident motorist or his legal representative is to relieve plaintiffs of the burden of searching for a defendant beyond the address disclosed in Registry records. This is in keeping with the mandate that every person who holds a driver's license, permit or registration must report any change of his name, residential address or mailing address in writing to the Registrar within thirty days after the date on which such change was made. There is no prerequisite that a person first attempt to obtain personal service over a defendant before proceeding under this statute.

#### **Library References:**

C.J.S. Motor Vehicles § 501, 502(1). West's Key No. Digests, Automobiles \$\infty\$=235.

# $\S$ 26.5 Venue

Venue pertains to the correct geographical location within the Commonwealth where a case must be brought, and insofar as it does not pertain to jurisdiction but is procedural, venue may be waived. Venue of so-called transitory actions are governed by M.G.L.A. c. 223, § 1 (Superior Court)<sup>2</sup> and § 2 (District Court).

A court may, in its discretion, dismiss a case based on the doctrine of forum non conveniens, but must proceed with caution. Appropriate considerations for deciding a motion to dismiss based on forum non conveniens include access to sources of proof, availability of compulsory process, cost of securing the attendance of witnesses, and enforceability of a judgment, if one were obtained, indicated that the litigation could be conducted more conveniently in a Canadian forum.<sup>3</sup> Thus, where al-

#### § 26.4

- Rososky v. Galligan, 1995 Mass.App. Div. 26, 1995 WL 91879 (1995).
- 2. Hardy v. Utica Mutual Insurance Co., 369 Mass. 696, 341 N.E.2d 651 (1976).
- 3. Touzin v. Smith, 6 Mass.App.Ct. 641, 381 N.E.2d 1313 (1978).
- 4. Touzin v. Smith, 6 Mass.App.Ct. 641, 381 N.E.2d 1313 (1978).
  - 5, M.G.L.A. c. 90, § 26A.
- 6. Munn v. Treantofel, 40 Mass.App. Dec. 85 (1968).

#### § 26.5

- Paige v. Sinclair, 237 Mass. 482, 484, 130 N.E. 177, 179 (1921).
- 2. Equitable actions brought in the Superior Court are subject to the same rules of venue as a legal action. See M.G.L.A. 214, § 5.
- 3. Joly v. Albert Larocque Lumber Ltd., 397 Mass. 43, 44, 489 N.E.2d 698; 699 (1986). W.R. Grace & Co. v. Hartford Acadent and Indemnity Co., 407 Mass. 572 577-578, 555 N.E.2d 214, 217-218 (1990).

3

COI

C.

tŀ

al

w

th

Cŧ

th

im

act pre wit cou

suc tri: a S

exc \$2 Ru dar fail pro

§ 1

rigl \$25 of t

4. 397

1. 2. 3.

**3.** 145,

# OTTENBERG & DUNKLESS LLP

COUNSELLORS AT LAW FILED OTH FLOOR 101 ARCH STREET, > 1200 Boston, Massachusetts 02110 PRIORE (617) 342-8600 (417) 342-7525

ROBERT C. DUNKLESS dunkless@ottenbergdunkless.com

JOHN C. OTTENBERG ottenberg@ottenbergdunkless.com

FAX (617) 342-7525

April 20, 2004

Clerk of United States District Court, District of Massachusetts United States Courthouse One Courthouse Way Boston, MA 01220

RE: Robert Olafson, et.al.v. Margaret Hamill, et.al. U.S.D.C. Civil Action No. 04-10158 MLW

Dear Sir/ Madam:

Enclosed please find an Affidavit of service of process as to the defendant Kyle Byrne and for filing and docketing.

Sincerely,

John C. Ottenberg

cc: Bruce R. Fox, Esq. 278 Midstate Office Park Auburn, MA 01501

C:\Gateway\WPfiles\WPFILES\Olafson\Letter to Clerk of US Corut41904.wpd